

**Remarks**

Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the Application and Claims 22-23 are newly presented herein.

**Allowable Claims**

The Applicant acknowledges with gratitude the Examiner's indication of allowability as to Claims 3-6 and 14-17.

**Claim amendments**

This response amends Claims 1, 6, 11 and 17 to clarify the scope of the invention. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in the originally filed Claims 6 and 17, on page 6, line 4, and Figure 3A of the specification. No new matter has been added.

This response amends Claims 4-5, 9, 15-16 and 20 to clarify the language of the claims by providing sufficient antecedent biases for all the limitations recited by the claims.

**New Claims**

This response adds new claims 22-23. The new claims are used to better protect the scope of the invention and are **not** offered in response to the Examiner's rejections. This response adds new claims 22-23 to more completely claim the invention.

Support for the new Claims 22-23 can be found in the original Claims 1 and 3, and 11 and 14, respectively.

**Claim objections**

The Examiner objects to Claims 4-5, 9, 11, 15-16 and 20 for not providing sufficient antecedent basis for limitations recited by these claims. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4-5, 9, 11, 15-16 and 20 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections and request the objection be withdrawn.

### **35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection**

Claims 1, 10-12 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kono (U.S. Patent No. 6,229,694). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner is reminded that “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP 2131 quoting *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co, of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The Examiner is also reminded that “[the] identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” MPEP 2131 quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicants submit that Kono does not teach each and every element as set forth in the rejected claims. In particular:

#### **Claim 1**

Applicants submit that Kono does not disclose, suggest or teach, *inter alia*, at least the following features recited by amended Claim 1 of the present application:

“a multimedia controller, ... having a **display module**” (emphasis added)

The Examiner asserts that “a multimedia controller” as claimed in Claim 1 is disclosed by Kono’s “keyboard 18.” See page 2, section 3 of the Official Action.

Applicants submit that Kono’s keyboard “18” does not contain a “display module” as recited in amended Claim 1. Hence, Claim 1 is patentable over Kono and should be allowed by the Examiner. Claim 10, at least based on its dependency on Claim 1, is also believed to be patentable over Kono.

#### **Claim 11**

Applicants submit that, at least for the reasons stated above, Kono does not teach, disclose or suggest “a multimedia controller, ... having a display module” as recited in amended Claim 11. Claims 12 and 21, at least based on their dependency on Claim 11, are also believed to be patentable over Kono.

**35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection**

Claims 2 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious by Kono and further in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 5,825,614).

Applicant submits that Claims 2 and 13, at least based on their dependency on Claims 1 and 11, respectively, are believed to be patentable over Kono and Kim, because there is no prima facie 35 USC 103(a) case based on Kono, as shown above, and because the Examiner has not shown to Applicants where Kim discloses, teaches or suggests the features not found in Kono.

**Patentability of new Claim 22**

Applicants acknowledge with gratitude the Examiner's indication of allowability as to Claim 3. Applicants have added new Claim 22 that contains limitations of Claim 1 and Claim 3 found patentable by the Examiner in the Office Action. Hence, Claim 22 is patentable and should be allowed by the Examiner.

**Patentability of new Claim 23**

Applicants acknowledge with gratitude the Examiner's indication of allowability as to Claim 14. Applicants have added new Claim 23 that contains limitations of Claim 11 and Claim 14 found patentable by the Examiner in the Office Action. Hence, Claim 23 is patentable and should be allowed by the Examiner.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.


I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents POB 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

September 9, 2004

(Date of Deposit)

Shannon Tinsley

(Name of Person Signing)




(Signature)

September 9, 2004

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Popa

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 43,010

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300

Encls: Fee for the excess claims;  
Post card.